



S Figure 2) Manhattan plots and MAF-stratified QQ-plots for UKB GWAS results

In the Manhattan plots, only association P-values < 0.05 are plotted. The significance threshold ($P = 5 \times 10^{-8}$) for association with the adiposity traits is plotted vertically in red. QQ plots are stratified by variants MAF in UKB




S Figure 3) Manhattan plots and MAF-stratified QQ-plots for CKB GWAS results

In the Manhattan plots, only association P-values < 0.05 are plotted. The significance threshold ($P = 5 \times 10^{-8}$) for association with the adiposity traits is plotted vertically in red. QQ plots are stratified by variants MAF in CKB.




S Figure 4) Flow diagram of the pipeline used to identify index variants from the TAMA results

To identify TA index variants we developed an iterative approach to conditional analysis using LD reference sets from both UKB and CKB to estimate conditional effect sizes at each TA loci, followed by TAMA of the biobank (BB) and sex-specific conditional results.




S Figure 5) Clumping process used to define loci in the TAMA

To define TA loci we used LD reference sets from both UKB and CKB to LD clump the TAMA results. We added 1000 BP up and downstream to the ancestry ‘specific’ clumps and where they overlapped we merged them into single clumps.



S Figure 6a) Manhattan plots and MAF-stratified QQ-plots for TAMA results


In the Manhattan plots, only association P-values < 0.05 are plotted. The significance threshold ($P = 5 \times 10^{-8}$) for association with the adiposity traits is plotted vertically in red. QQ plots are stratified by variants MAF in UKB and also in CKB.




S Figure 6b) Manhattan plots and MAF-stratified QQ-plots for TAMA results

In the Manhattan plots, only association P-values < 0.05 are plotted. The significance threshold ($P = 5 \times 10^{-8}$) for association with the adiposity traits is plotted vertically in red. QQ plots are stratified by variants MAF in UKB and also in CKB.

a) Effect sizes of UKB variants in CKB and UKB




b) Effect sizes of UKB variants in GIANT and UKB




S Figure 7) Effect sizes of variants at loci identified in the UKB analysis and not in the TAMA

Effect sizes are reported on a SD scale, error bars represent the standard error of the estimate. Associations that show some evidence (P_{het} adjusted for false discovery rate (FDR) < 0.05) for heterogeneity in effect between CKB and UKB or GIANT and UKB are highlighted in blue.

a) Effect sizes of CKB variants in UKB and CKB





b) Effect sizes of CKB variants in TWB and CKB



S Figure 8) Effect sizes of variants at loci identified in the CKB analysis and not in the TAMA





Effect sizes are reported on a SD scale, error bars represent the standard error of the estimate. Associations that show some evidence (P_{het} adjusted for FDR < 0.05) for heterogeneity in effect between UKB and CKB or TWB and CKB are highlighted in blue.



S Figure 9) Tissue expression profile of genes lying in close proximity of index variants in loci associated with a) overall adiposity or b) body fat distribution traits
 Genes were prioritized for analysis based on lying within 10kb of index variants of loci that were associated with either the overall adiposity or body fat distribution traits. Differentially expressed genes (DEG) were assessed using data from GTEx v8. Significantly enriched DEG sets ($P_{\text{bon}} < 0.05$) are highlighted in red.





S Figure 10) Tissue expression profile of genes lying in close proximity of index variants in loci associated with traits classed as overall adiposity traits

For each trait, genes were prioritized for analysis based on lying within 10kb of index variants of loci that were associated with that trait. Differentially expressed genes (DEG) were assessed using data from GTEx v8. Significantly enriched DEG sets ($P_{\text{bon}} < 0.05$) are highlighted in red.




S Figure 11) Tissue expression profile of genes lying in close proximity of index variants in loci associated with traits classed as body fat distribution traits


For each trait, genes were prioritized for analysis based on lying within 10kb of index variants of loci that were associated with that trait. Differentially expressed genes (DEG) were assessed using data from GTEx v8. Significantly enriched DEG sets ($P_{\text{bon}} < 0.05$) are highlighted in red.




a) SNP Based heritability



b) Trans-ancestral genetic correlation




c) Pairwise cross-trait genetic correlation




S Figure 12) Assessment of the sex-specific genetic architecture of the adiposity traits in UKB and CKB

- Sex-specific SNP-based heritability estimated from the UKB and CKB sex-specific GWAS results using LDSC regression.
- Trans-ancestral genetic correlation estimated from the UKB and CKB sex-specific GWAS results using Popcorn.
- Sex-specific genetic correlation between the adiposity traits estimated from the UKB and CKB sex-specific GWAS results using LDSC regression. Black boxes indicate significant heterogeneity (all P -values $< 10^{-3}$) between the biobanks for each sex. The alpha threshold was Bonferroni corrected by the 28 cross-trait comparisons made for the 2 sexes.





S Figure 13) Score performance in UKB and CKB for all traits assessed

Partial r^2 values were estimated in the unrelated subset of UKB and CKB from the regression of each adiposity trait against the corresponding score with adjustment for study specific PCs, age, age² and sex. The 95% CI are plotted based on the standard error of the partial r^2 values estimated using Olkin and Finn's approximation.



S Figure 14) Score performance in UKB and CKB stratified by sex

Partial r^2 values were estimated in the unrelated subset of UKB and CKB from the regression of each adiposity trait against the corresponding score with adjustment for study specific PCs, age, age². The regression was stratified by sex. The 95% CI are plotted based on the standard error of the partial r^2 values estimated using Olkin and Finn's approximation.




S Figure 15) MAF and LD differences between UKB and CKB

- a) MAF in UKB and CKB of conditionally independent variants associated with the adiposity traits in UKB. Mean MAF values in each cohort are reported and represented by the dashed lines.
- b) Association results and LD at the *MC4R* locus in UKB and CKB, the causal variant at the locus is 18:58039276:C:T. The lead variant at the locus selected in the UKB GWAS was 18:58040789:A:G, while the lead variant selected in CKB was 18:58030420:A:AAGAT.

UKB association results with UKB reference panel


TA association results with UKB reference panel

TA association results with CKB reference panel




S Figure 16) Locus zoom plots of regions of the genome where the lead signal changes between the UKB and TA analyses.

Each row represents a genomic region, the first column is plotted using the UKB association statistics and UKB LD reference panel, the second column is plotted using the TA association statistics and UKB LD reference panel and the third column is plotted using the TA association statistics and CKB LD reference panel. The lead signal in each analysis is colored in purple and the variant detected as the lead signal in the opposing analysis is labelled with its SNP id.




S Figure 17) Comparison of the predictive performance in EURs of subsets of the UKB and TA scores that are matched by loci.




S Figure 18) Score performance in MCPs participants with low EUR ancestry.

Individuals in MCPs that have a low proportion (< 20%) of EUR ancestry were identified using ADMIXTURE analysis. Partial r^2 values were estimated in the “low EUR” subset of MCPs from the regression of each adiposity trait against the corresponding score with adjustment for study specific PCs, age, age² and sex.



S Figure 19) Comparison of the UKB, TA and CKB scores against PRScs score performance

Using the UKB GWAS results and the EUR UKB LD reference dataset provided with the PRScs program we derived a list of variants and weights to be used in the construction of PRScs scores for BMI, WC, HIP and WHR. Partial r^2 values were estimated in the unrelated subset of TWB and BBJ from the regression of each adiposity trait against the corresponding score with adjustment for study specific PCs, age, age² and sex.



S Figure 20) Score performance in independent EUR cohorts where 15% or more of score variants were not imputed